arXiv:1510.07383v1 [math.RA] 26 Oct 2015

Order-indices and order-periods of 3×3 matrices over commutative inclines

Song-Chol Han*, Gum-Song Sin

Faculty of Mathematics, Kim Il Sung University, Pyongyang, DPR Korea

Abstract

An incline is an additively idempotent semiring in which the product of two elements is always less than or equal to either factor. By making use of prime numbers, this paper proves that $A^{11} \leqslant A^5$ for all 3×3 matrices A over an arbitrary commutative incline, thus giving an answer to an open problem "For 3×3 matrices over any incline (even noncommutative) is $X^5 \geqslant X^{11}$?", proposed by Cao, Kim and Roush in a monograph *Incline Algebra and Applications*, *1984*.

AMS subject classification: 16Y60; 15A99

Keywords: Semiring; Incline matrix; Order-index; Order-period; Walk

1. Introduction

Inclines are additively idempotent semirings in which products are less than or equal to either factor. Boolean algebra, fuzzy algebra and distributive lattice are examples of inclines. The study of inclines is generally acknowledged to have started by Z.Q. Cao in a series of his papers in the early 1980's. Incline algebra and incline matrix theory have been extensively studied by many authors. Nowadays, one may clearly notice a growing interest in developing the algebraic theory of inclines and their numerous significant applications in diverse branches of mathematics and computer science such as automata theory, graph theory, informational systems, complex systems modelling, decision-making theory, dynamical programming, control theory, clustering and so on (see [4]). Inclines are also called simple semirings (see [2]).

Cao et al. [1] introduced the notion of the order-index and order-period of an element in a partially ordered semigroup, and proposed an open problem "For 3×3 matrices over any incline (even noncommutative) is $X^5 \geqslant X^{11}$?" (see the fourth open problem in Section 5.5 in [1]).

Han and Li [3] proved that $A^{k+d} \leqslant A^k$ and thus the order-index of A is at most k for all $n \times n$ matrices A over an arbitrary commutative incline, where

* Corresponding author. *E-mail:* ryongnam5@yahoo.com

$k = (n-1)^2 + 1$ and d is any given multiple of $[n]$ satisfying $d \geqslant nk(\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_n^i)$. In the case of $n = 3$, one can easily conclude that $A^{233} \leqslant A^5$ and so the order-index of A is at most 5 for all 3×3 matrices A over any commutative incline (because $k = 5$, $[n] = 6$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_n^i = P_3^1 + P_3^2 + P_3^3 = 15$).

In this paper, we prove that $A^{11} \leqslant A^5$ for all 3×3 matrices A over an arbitrary commutative incline by using prime numbers, thereby giving an answer to the above open problem.

2. Preliminaries

We recall some known definitions and facts.

Definition 2.1 [1]. Let $+$ and $\cdot$ be two binary operations on a nonempty set L. An algebraic system $(L, +, \cdot)$ is called an incline if it satisfies the following conditions:

(1) $(L, +)$ is a semilattice,
(2) $(L, \cdot)$ is a semigroup,
(3) $x(y + z) = xy + xz$ and $(y + z)x = yx + zx$ for all $x, y, z \in L$,
(4) $x + xy = x + yx = x$ for all $x, y \in L$.

On an incline L, define a relation $\leqslant$ by $x \leqslant y \Leftrightarrow x + y = y$. It is easy to see that $\leqslant$ is a partial order on L and that for any $x, y \in L$, the sum $x + y$ is the least upper bound of $\{x, y\} \subseteq L$, i.e., $x + y = x \vee y$ in the poset $(L, \leqslant)$. It follows that $xy \leqslant x$ and $yx \leqslant x$ for all $x, y \in L$ and that for any $x, y, z \in L$, $y \leqslant z$ implies $xy \leqslant xz$ and $yx \leqslant zx$.

An incline L is said to be commutative if $xy = yx$ for all $x, y \in L$.

The Boolean algebra $(\{0, 1\}, \vee, \wedge)$ is an incline. More generally, every distributive lattice is an incline. Each fuzzy algebra $([0, 1], \vee, T)$ is an incline, where T is a t-norm. The tropical algebra $(\mathbb{R}_0^+ \cup \{\infty\}, \wedge, +)$ is an incline, where $\mathbb{R}_0^+$ is the set of all nonnegative real numbers.

In the sequel, L always denotes any given commutative incline, n denotes any given positive integer greater than or equal to 2, $\underline{n}$ stands for the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, and $[n]$ denotes the least common multiple of integers $1, 2, \ldots, n$. For a nonnegative integer l, $\underline{l}^0$ denotes the set of integers 0 through l.

We denote by $L^{n\times n}$ the set of all $n \times n$ matrices over L. Given $A = (a_{ij}) \in L^{n\times n}$ and $B = (b_{ij}) \in L^{n\times n}$, we define the product $A \cdot B \in L^{n\times n}$ by $A \cdot B := \left(\sum_{k\in\underline{n}} a_{ik} b_{kj} \right)$. And we denote $A \leqslant B$ when $a_{ij} \leqslant b_{ij}$ for all $i, j \in \underline{n}$.

Then $(L^{n\times n}, \leqslant, \cdot)$ is a partially ordered semigroup, i.e., for all $A, B, C, D \in L^{n\times n}$, the following hold.

(1) $(AB)C = A(BC)$,
(2) $A \leqslant B$ and $C \leqslant D \Rightarrow AC \leqslant BD$.

Given a matrix $A \in L^{n\times n}$, its powers are defined as follows: $A^1 := A$, $A^l := A^{l-1}A$ for all $l \geqslant 2$.

Definition 2.2 [1]. Let S be a partially ordered semigroup and $a \in S$. The order-index of a is the least such positive integer k that $a^{k+d} \leqslant a^k$ for some positive integer d. The order-period of a is the least such positive integer d that $a^{k+d} \leqslant a^k$ for some positive integer k.

Definition 2.3 [3]. Let $V : v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_l$ be a sequence of positive integers such that $v_i \in \underline{n}$ for all $i \in \underline{l}^0$. We call V a walk on $\underline{n}$, $l(V) := l$ the length of V, and v_i ($i \in \underline{l}^0$) the terms of V. When $l \geqslant 1$, for any $p, q \in \underline{n}$, we put $m(V; p, q) := |\{i \in \underline{(l-1)}^0 \mid v_i = p, v_{i+1} = q\}|$. Let $U : u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_h$ be another walk on $\underline{n}$. U is called a reduction of V if $u_0 = v_0$, $u_h = v_l$ and $m(U; p, q) \leqslant m(V; p, q)$ for all $p, q \in \underline{n}$.

3. Main results

Lemma 3.1. *Let $P = (p_{ij})$ be an $n \times n$ matrix consisting of n^2 distinct prime numbers. Let $V : v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_l$ be a walk on $\underline{n}$ with length $l \geqslant 1$ and let $U : u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_h$ be another walk on $\underline{n}$ with length $h \geqslant 1$ satisfying $u_0 = v_0$ and $u_h = v_l$. If the product $\prod_{r=0}^{h-1} p_{u_r u_{r+1}} = p_{u_0u_1}p_{u_1u_2}\cdots p_{u_{h-1}u_h}$ divides the product $\prod_{s=0}^{l-1} p_{v_s v_{s+1}} = p_{v_0v_1}p_{v_1v_2}\cdots p_{v_{l-1}v_l}$, then U is a reduction of V.*

Proof. Since the entries p_{ij} of P are distinct primes, the divisibility implies that the multiplicity of each prime factor $p_{u_r u_{r+1}}$ in the product $\prod_{r=0}^{h-1} p_{u_r u_{r+1}}$ is less than or equal to its multiplicity in the product $\prod_{s=0}^{l-1} p_{v_s v_{s+1}}$. Hence we have $m(U; u_r, u_{r+1}) \leqslant m(V; u_r, u_{r+1})$ for all $r \in \underline{(h-1)}^0$, and so U is a reduction of V. □

Lemma 3.2. *Every walk on $\underline{3}$ with length 11 has a reduction with length 5.*

Proof. Putting

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 3 & 5 \\ 7 & 11 & 13 \\ 17 & 19 & 23 \end{pmatrix}$$

and using Lemma 3.1, the statement is verified by a direct computation. □

Theorem 3.3. *If $A \in L^{3\times 3}$, then $A^{11} \leqslant A^5$.*

Proof. Let $A = (a_{ij})$. We denote $A^5 = \left(a_{ij}^{(5)}\right)$ and $A^{11} = \left(a_{ij}^{(11)}\right)$. For any $i, j \in \underline{3}$, we have $a_{ij}^{(11)} = \sum_{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{10} \in \underline{3}} a_{iv_1}a_{v_1v_2}\cdots a_{v_{10}j}$. Consider every summand $a_{iv_1}a_{v_1v_2}\cdots a_{v_{10}j}$ of $a_{ij}^{(11)}$. By Lemma 3.2, the walk $i, v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{10}, j$ on $\underline{3}$ with length 11 has a reduction i, u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, j with length 5. Noticing

that L is a commutative incline, we obtain

$$a_{iv_1}a_{v_1v_2}\cdots a_{v_{10}j} \leqslant a_{iu_1}a_{u_1u_2}\cdots a_{u_4j} \leqslant \sum_{k_1,k_2,k_3,k_4\in\underline{3}} a_{ik_1}a_{k_1k_2}\cdots a_{k_4j} = a_{ij}^{(5)}.$$

Since this inequality holds for all summands of $a_{ij}^{(11)}$, we have $a_{ij}^{(11)} \leqslant a_{ij}^{(5)}$, as required. □

Corollary 3.4. The order-periods of 3×3 matrices over any commutative incline are at most 6.

4. An algorithm for verification

We present an algorithm for verifying Lemma 3.2:

Step 1. Input the 3×3 matrix $P = (p_{ij})$ given in the proof of Lemma 3.2 and put $cnt = 0$.
Step 2. Choose a walk $i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_{10}, i_{11}$ on $\underline{3}$ with length 11 and compute the product $X = p_{i_0i_1} * p_{i_1i_2} * \cdots * p_{i_{10}i_{11}}$.
Step 3. Choose a walk $i_0, j_1, \ldots, j_4, i_{11}$ on $\underline{3}$ with length 5 and compute the product $Y = p_{i_0j_1} * p_{j_1j_2} * \cdots * p_{j_4i_{11}}$.
Step 4. Check if Y divides X. If yes, then output the walk $i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_{10}, i_{11}$ and its reduction $i_0, j_1, \ldots, j_4, i_{11}$, and go to Step 7. Otherwise, go to Step 5.
Step 5. Check if all such walks on $\underline{3}$ with length 5 have been tested. If yes, then go to Step 6. Otherwise, go to Step 3.
Step 6. Output the walk $i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_{10}, i_{11}$ which has no reduction with length 5 and add 1 to *cnt*.
Step 7. Check if all walks on $\underline{3}$ with length 11 have been tested. If yes, then go to Step 8. Otherwise, go to Step 2.
Step 8. Output the value of *cnt*, i.e., the total number of such walks on $\underline{3}$ with length 11 that have no reduction with length 5. Output the run time.

We describe a computer program corresponding to the algorithm presented above:

```
#include ⟨stdio.h⟩
#include ⟨time.h⟩
typedef __int64 INT;

INT X, Y;
int p[3][3] = {2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23};
int cnt, walk[12], walk_[6];

int g(int k, int m, int last)
{
```

```
walk_[k] = m;
if (k == 4)
{
walk_[5] = last;
Y *= p[m][last];
int ok = false;
if (X % Y == 0)
{
ok = true;
int j;
for (j = 0; j < 12; j++) printf("%d ", walk[j] + 1);
for (printf(":"), j = 0; j < 6; j++) printf(" %d", walk_[j] + 1);
puts("");
}
Y /= p[m][last];
return ok;
}
for (int i = 0; i < 3; i++)
{
Y *= p[m][i];
int ok = g(k + 1, i, last);
Y /= p[m][i];
if (ok) return 1;
}
return 0;
}

int f(int k, int m)
{
walk[k] = m;
if (k == 11)
{
if (!g(0, 0, m))
{
cnt++;
for (int j = 0; j < 12; j++) printf("%d ", walk[j] + 1);
puts(":  no reduction of length 5");
}
return 0;
}
for (int i = 0; i < 3; i++)
{
```

```
X *= p[m][i];
f(k + 1, i);
X /= p[m][i];
}
return 0;
}
int main()
{
freopen("out.txt", "w", stdout);
double _t = clock();
X = Y = 1;
f(0, 0);
printf("count = %d\n", cnt);
printf("%lf\n", clock() - _t);
return 0;
}
```

The program has been run in 2 seconds on Windows XP version 2002, IBM-PC Computer with Intel(R) Pentium(R) 4 CPU 2.80 GHz, 248MB RAM and 80GB Hard Disk. The displayed result showed that the total number of such walks on $\underline{3}$ with length 11 that have no reduction with length 5 is *zero*.

5. Conclusions

This paper proved that $A^{11} \leqslant A^5$ for all 3×3 matrices A over any commutative incline. The following problem is still open: For 3×3 matrices X over any noncommutative incline is $X^5 \geqslant X^{11}$?

References

[1] Z.Q. Cao, K.H. Kim, F.W. Roush, Incline Algebra and Applications, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1984.

[2] J.S. Golan, Semirings and their Applications, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1999.

[3] S.C. Han, H.X. Li, Maximum order-index of matrices over commutative inclines: An answer to an open problem, Linear Algebra Appl. 420 (2007) 228–234.

[4] K.H. Kim, F.W. Roush, Inclines and incline matrices: a survey, Linear Algebra Appl. 379 (2004) 457–473.